

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/810,866	310,866 03/29/2004		Peter Gallina	P24995	9867	
7055	7590	10/24/2006		EXAMINER		
		RNSTEIN, P.L.C	LAZORCIK, JASON L			
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,				1731		
				DATE MAILED: 10/24/2004	DATE MAILED: 10/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		(				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Communication	10/810,866	GALLINA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jason L. Lazorcik	1731				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time  11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ma	arch 2004.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
	,					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	alastian rancinamant					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2004 is/are: a	ı)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	• ,	` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents</li> </ol>	have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priori	•	d in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	, , , ,	d				
See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	or the certified copies flot received	u.				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)  Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal Pa					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/29/2004</u> .	6)					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Priority**

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

This application is claiming the benefit of prior-filed nonprovisional application No. 09/512,304, filed February 24, 2000 and application 09/176,962, filed October 22, 1998 under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c). Copendency between the current application and the prior application is required. Since the applications are not copending, the benefit claim to the prior-filed nonprovisional application is improper. The applicant is directed to two separate breaks in continuity between the present application and prior filed applications to which the current claim of continuity is directed. Specifically, a first break in application continuity exists between the date of abandonment of application 09/176,962 on 12/28/1999 and the filing date of application 09/512,304 on 02/24/2000, and a second break in application continuity exists between the date of abandonment of application 09/512,304 on 03/02/2004 and the filing date of the present application 10/810,866 on 03/29/2004.

Applicant is required to delete the reference to the prior-filed application from the first sentence(s) of the specification, or the application data sheet, depending on where the reference was originally submitted, unless applicant can establish copendency between the applications.

Art Unit: 1731

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) based upon an applications filed in Germany on 10/24/1997, 05/06/1998, 05/08/1998, and 05/27/1998. A claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) cannot be based on said application, since copendency with application United States 09/176,962 has not been established as set forth above, and the immediate United States application was filed more than twelve months after the foreign filing dates.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5,11, 13, 15-18, and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Cedra et. al (DE 297 23 289 U1).

Precedent for the basis of Claims 1-5 can be found in the prior art on page 3, lines 1-24

Precedent for claim 11 is set forth on pages 5 line 29 through page 6, line 5

Precedent for claim 13 can be found on page 4, lines 16-24

Claims 15 through 18 are clearly set forth in the prior art on page 6, lines 16-23

Precedent for claims 20 through 23 can be found in the prior art on page 3, lines 1-24 and page 4, lines 26- page5, line 3

Application/Control Number: 10/810,866 Page 4

Art Unit: 1731

Precedent for claim 24 can be found in the prior art page 6, lines 16-23 and on page 4, lines 26- page5, line 3.

The above application of the prior art under 35 USC 102(b) to the immediate claims has been set forth in order to assist the applicant in determining the relevant sections of the prior art document in the context of the applicants claimed invention. Due to the applicants assertion of foreign priority under 35 USC 119 over the prior art and the fact that the applicant has failed to successfully establish a claim thereto for the reasons set forth above, the immediate reference is treated as valid prior art for the present application. Therefore, the burden is shifted to the applicant to demonstrate that the claimed invention is neither explicitly nor implicitly disclosed in the prior art.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 6-10, 12, 14, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cedra et. al. (DE 297 23 289 U1) as applied to Claim 1 above under 35 USC 102(b) and in further view of Steiner et. al. (DE 198 23 739 A1).

'289 fails to explicitly indicate the location of the guiding or the applying of the coating medium in the context of the wider manufacturing process. The '739 reference sets forth (column 3, line 28 through column 4, line 54, and Figures 1-4) a manufacture process incorporating the teachings of the '289 reference and disclosing locations for the guiding and applying processes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the coating process disclosed in '289 into a larger manufacture process as described in '739 in order to produce a finished paper or cardboard product.

In similar fashion to the discussion for the use of applicants foreign priority documents in the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) above, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of claims 6-10, 12, 14, and 19 has been set forth in order to assist the applicant in determining the relevant sections of the prior art documents in the context of the applicants claimed invention. Given the applicants assertion of foreign priority under 35 USC 119 over the prior art it is understood that said foreign prior art documents collectively provide every limitation for the claimed invention in the US application. Since the applicant has failed to successfully establish a valid claim to foreign priority for the reasons set forth above, the immediate references are treated as valid prior art for the present application. Therefore, the burden is shifted to the applicant to demonstrate that the claimed invention is neither explicitly nor implicitly disclosed in the combined teachings of Cedra and Steiner.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. DE 197 47 091A1 provides pertinent information relevant to the claimed coating application process.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason L. Lazorcik whose telephone number is (571) 272-2217. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on (571) 272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/810,866

Art Unit: 1731

JLL

ERIC HUG PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 7